DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 449 578 EA 030 866

AUTHOR Bogotch, Ira E.
TITLE Reclaiming Pedagogy in National Standards for Educational Leaders.
PUB DATE 2000-04-00
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, Louisiana, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Competency Based Education; *Educational Change; *Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Instruction; *Leadership; *National Standards; Student Improvement

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a "recorded history" of national leadership standards, a critique of that history, along with a conceptual framework for how the national standards movement is viewed. The analysis offers a deconstruction of the recorded history, emphasizing the specific events surrounding the spread of educational leadership standards. A distinction between "history" and "recorded history" is made: educational leadership has a history where events come alive with emotion, debate, politics, and intrigue; by contrast, the recorded history of standards notes that over the past 2 decades a series of national education reports has been published by commissions appointed by professional associations and philanthropic foundations, each trying to improve the quality of educational leadership. A critical reading of the recorded history, however, indicates these reports are not a true history filled with debates and political intrigue, but a political narrative that tries to convince and persuade policymakers, researchers, and practitioners that the different constituencies had set aside their philosophical differences in educational leadership approaches and training in order to reach a consensus on national standards. What is missing, however, are the first-person eyewitness accounts, after-the-fact interviews, and backroom and hallway meetings. (Contains 23 references.) (DFR)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 449 578

Reclaiming Pedagogy in National Standards for Educational Leaders

By Ira E. Bogotch
Florida Atlantic University
Department of Educational Leadership

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

I. Bogotch

EA 030866

Reclaiming Pedagogy in National Standards for Educational Leaders[1]

By Ira E. Bogotch
Florida Atlantic University
Department of Educational Leadership

Mise en scene

Good people as well as committed educators differ on whether the standards' movement will improve teaching and learning for all children (Meier, 2000; Taylor, November, 2000). In 1991, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development board noted that "with remarkedly little deliberation or involvement of practicing educators, the United States appears to be rushing headlong toward a new national student assessment system and its implied national curriculum" (O'Neil, May, 1991, p. 1). Nine months later, however, the U.S. Senate unanimously voted to support a National Education Goals Panel. Even for Goals Panel member Marshall Smith,"This is new territory for the United States, It deserves a lot of attention" (Rothman, February, 1992, p.8). My own research on the role of standards began in the late eighties where I focused on school-level dynamics as part of Dade County's reform efforts to implement school-based management. It was evident to me then [and it still is] that the standards-assessment continuum was too simplistic a framework for understanding how schools might improve teaching and learning. I identified a complicated management model where specific tasks and such factors as information and incentives, as well as standards and assessments, influenced the school improvement process (Bogotch, Williams, & Hale; 1995). Today, over a decade later, there are still principled disagreements – none of which profess to be, nor should they be, the last word. Therefore, I believe that it is up to all of us, educators and citizens, to continue to articulate our positions toward moving schools and particularly school leadership in the direction of promoting the improvement of teaching and learning.

In this paper, I will present the "recorded history"[2] of national leadership standards, a critique of that history along with a conceptual framework for how I view the national standards movement.[3] Throughout this journey, I have taken a critically pragmatic view of standards which has led me to promoting pedagogical activities which have been part of the standards movement, at least at the development stages. Such a position I believe, will allow us to discover and rediscover the joys of teaching and learning while participating in this latest phase of national educational reform.

The Record History of Leadership Standards: Power/Language/Logic

My analysis begins with a deconstruction of the "recorded history," emphasizing the specific events surrounding the promulgation of educational leadership standards. As an academic discipline, the field of history serves to legitimize past actions, specifically the past actions identified by an author. Its chronological format, with dates and events, are familiar markers lending credence to the accounts as written. It is precisely because of the legitimacy ascribed to these markers that we ought to question all recorded histories: who are its authors, what is the knowledge base, what values do they espouse, and who benefits from the recorded history? These and other critical questions point not only towards the reconstruction of alternative professional perspectives [e.g., transformational leadership, postmodern ideas, and critical pedagogy], but also

introduces a broader horizon [e.g., social philosophy] to the discussions and issues surrounding the standards' movement.

Before expanding on "recorded history," I would like to make clear the distinction between "history" and what I am calling "recorded history." Educational leadership has a history. Here is just one example: In 1957, Hollis Moore wrote an historical account of an NCPEA meeting which had taken place seven years before. The discussion focused on the Kellog Foundation's decision to fund a "program" to improve the quality and training of school administrators.

> "... not everyone was excited; some were angry, and others thought it a matter of little importance. Many knew that they would be left out.... After all, the Korean War was being waged, and that was what should be most important....When it was quite clear that the conference wanted no part of the war, Melby [the spokesperson for this position] walked out in protest, but he walked out alone" (Griffiths, 1999, p. xiv).

In this very brief account, the events of the moment come alive with emotion, debate, politics, and intrigue. Neither the author nor myself is romanticizing what took place; Moore through Griffiths is simply recounting meaningful events surrounding real people.

In contrast, the "recorded history" of standards notes that over the past two decades, a series of national education reports have been published by blue ribbon commissions appointed by professional associations and philanthropic foundations, each charged with improving the quality of educational leadership in our schools. Currently, the task of educational leadership reform has been entrusted to the National Policy Board for Educational Administration [NPBEA], a board comprised of 10 professional associations. Each of the participants represents a different constituency, with deep-seated differences regarding the qualifications and attributes of educational leaders. The constituencies range from practicing school administrators [e.g., AASA] to university professors [e.g., UCEA]. None of the individual associations, however, appears to be strong enough to unilaterally effect national education policy. Thus, it has taken a protracted national debate, over a period of two decades, for any broad acceptance by this coalition of associations -- and, consequently, any decision is, by necessity, a compromise.

Historically, the cumulative weight of such compromise-based national reports has coalesced into what Dewey called an "abiding framework" (Dewey, 1920/1948, p.33). This abiding framework has been depicted in the "recorded history" of standards – as an uninterrupted progression from competencies to proficiencies to standards. Thus, by 1994, national standards for educational leadership could claim to be the unifying metaphor as expressed by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium, a program of the Council of Chief State School Officers. By 1999, two of the most prominent educational leaders consumated this consensus by writing that, "our profession continues with agreement" (Forsyth, 1999, p. 85)and "never again can the profession be divided and unfocused as it has been periodically in the past" (Thomson, 1999, p. 113).

A critical reading of this "recorded history," however, indicates that these reports are less a true

history fraught with heated debates and political intrigue and more a political narrative woven to convince and persuade policymakers, researchers, as well as practitioners that the different constituencies had set aside their philosophical differences in educational leadership approaches and training in order to reach a consensus on national standards. Missing, however, are the first person eyewitness accounts, after-the-fact interviews, backroom and hallway meetings. Where were the conflicts? Who took what positions in the debates? Instead, "recorded history" seems to have a different, impersonal style in which the listing of commissions and dates are all that is necessary to understand what happened.

To their credit, the authors of educational leadership's "recorded history" have not tried to hide their intentions. Thomson provided a glimpse into the confluence of power, language, and logic in his chapter in Murphy & Forsyth. He wrote that with the printing of 2,500 copies of Alternative Certification for School Leaders [i.e., one of the systemic reforms operating along parallel lines with the standards' movement],"The NPBEA had begun to act where politics and profession intersect rather than confining its initiatives to the profession alone" (p. 100).

Van Meter & Murphy, (1997), in their report to ISLLC/CCSSO, provided more details of the intended political consequences:

> Our belief in the power of standards to enhance quality has been rewarded.... For example, Mississippi is engaged in a comprehensive review of all eight of its preparation programs to ensure that the new standards anchor the education of prospective school leaders. Mississippi will also be evaluated on the extent to which their graduates successfully complete assessments grounded in the ISLLC standards (pp. 5-6).

In answering the question, "why standards," the authors were very explicit. They wrote that standards are an appropriate and powerful leverage point for reform; they fill a void for a common set of standards; and that

> "the standards approach provided the best avenue to allow diverse stakeholders to drive improvement efforts along a variety of fronts — by improving the quality of programs that prepare school leaders and ensuring greater accountability for the efforts of these programs; by upgrading and bring greater coherence to professional development experiences for school leaders; by creating a framework to better assess candidates for licensure and relicensure; and by establishing a foundation on which certification programs can be constructed" (p. 7).

Murphy and Forsyth (1999) stated for all to see that the standards developed "through the manipulation of state control over areas such as licensure, relicensure, and program approval" (p. 28). Forsyth then repeats an assertion taken from a previous era, an era truly marked by controversy" "at least 300 universities and colleges [out of 505] should cease preparing

educational administrators" (1987-88, 1999)]. This assertion, repeated a decade later, as a matter-of-fact holds that a majority of university programs then and now should be decertified – as if the conditions a decade ago had not changed. But hadn't Forsyth and Thomson through ISLLC claimed that we were in an era of political and professional consensus? Why repeat this declaration of civil war today?

As one of the two university voices at the NPBEA table, Patrick Forsyth, wrote: "In my view, it would be a great loss to the profession if research universities were to lose their right to participate in the preparation of school administrators. However, I believe they will lose that right unless they can abandon a preoccupation with lines of research that are irrelevant to practice and design and provide rigorous preparation in both technical and practice knowledge" (P. Forsyth, UCEA Newsletter, Fall, 1999, p. 17). Here the critique is self-directed. Again, it is unclear who the enemy is or how the quality of educational leadership programs are to be measured. It is only my speculation that perhaps such statements were the price exacted by the powerful NPBEA onto their university colleagues [who were outnumbered at the table 8 to 2] in order for some university voices to remain at the table. Still it is puzzling and unresolved how there can be consensus and declarations of war at the same time. It would take more than the writings of "record history" to reveal this history.

Adding to these unanswered questions is the fact that a prominent university professor, Joseph Murphy, was named ISLLC Chair. What confluence of political dynamics were at work here? Another speculation on my part – state administrative certification in all fifty states currently resides within university educational leadership departments. Therefore, the professional associations, as well as state departments of education must continue to negotiate with universities in order to exercise their respective powers. The selection of a university educational leadership spokesperson as the ISLLC Chair may have been a strategical choice. Murphy's voice connected state departments and professional associations to educational leadership departments. His widely read book on the "landscape" of educational leadership preparation, demonstrated to the NPBEA a willingness to reconstruct the linguistic meanings of educational leadership. But while Professor Murphy gave universities, especially educational leadership departments, a strong pro-university voice in the development of the national standards, it is unclear how the National and State standards' movement could challenge the dominant position and values of the majority members of the NPBEA. It is unclear also how the minority university voices will continue being heard once the standards' movement moves beyond development and into licensure, re-licensure, and assessment issues.

ISLLC Standards Development

The first draft of the ISLLC Standards was circulated in July, 1996, with a cover letter signed by Neil Shipman, director of ISLLC and Joseph Murphy, ISLLC Chair, setting the stage for statewide reform efforts to align with this national initiative. The document stated that ISLLC was "a parsimonious model," with only six broad standards (Preface: July 17, 1996) written in a format of knowledge, dispositions, and performance, a model borrowed directly from the Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC). In their transmitting draft, Shipman

and Murphy wrote:

> "While there was little debate about the importance of knowledge and performances in the framework, the inability to 'assess' dispositions caused some of us a good deal of consternation at the outset of the project. As we became more enmeshed in the work, however, we discovered that the dispositions often occupied center stage... in many fundamental ways they nourish and give meaning to performance" (Preface. p. 4).

This statement revealed two insights: the first was that the discussion of dispositions had led to a discovery; that is, while "enmeshed in the work" new learning had occurred among prominent educators. Although I reserve my strongest critique to this area of dispositions [see below], what is significant is that a learning process took place during development – one that surprised these experts. The second insight emerging from this brief quote was that while ISLLC had borrowed an intact model, only one third of the model triggered new learning. Two-thirds of the model, knowledge and performance, had *a priori* and a posteriori consensus. Why hadn't these latter areas as well triggered discussions leading to surprising new knowledge? Surely, the educational leadership participants themselves were aware that each of the three dimensions were problematical: knowledge, performance as well as the dispositions. At best, the knowledge contained in the written standards, a knowledge based on the existing knowledge of the participants, represents only one way of knowing educational leadership – as Joseph Murphy himself had previously noted (see Donmoyer, Imber, & Scheursch, 1995).
As for the dimension of performances, what was described in the standards, is based on someone who looks and acts like a leader when the knowledge and dispositions are already clearly defined. Here performance is strictly a re-presentation of leadership as it currently exists, rather than a re-invention of educational leadership. Whatever evidence would be needed to document performance in an administrator portfolio would have to re-assure others outside of education that schools had indeed appointed leaders to positions of authority. Standards are, of course, central to the politics of accountability.

ISLLC-Like Language

At the same time, the language of the ISLLC Standards is heuristic. It presents a written model of leadership by which to compare ongoing leadership practices. For some, such a model truly represents a departure from current practices. But the question regarding its language is whether the standards are truly a progression from mere competencies and individual proficiencies to something collectively higher. Only then would the language of the standards reflect progress.

Staying inside the framework of "recorded history" I compared the language of the National Commission reform reports (e.g., 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, and 1991) with today's ISLLC Standards. For example, the following list of "standards" was written by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPB) in May, 1989 and was titled Improving the Preparation of School Administrators: An agenda for reform.

The May, 1989 report had a nine item agenda. Item six stated the elements of curriculum as

follows:

societal and cultural influences on schooling;
teaching and learning processes and school improvement;
organizational theory;
methodologies of organizational studies and policy analysis;
leadership and management processes and functions;
policy studies and politics of education;
moral and ethical dimensions of schooling.

Less than one year later, in March, 1990, the same group members wrote The Preparation of School Administrators: A Statement of Purpose. The similarities [and differences] between the language of May, 1989 with March, 1990 are striking. I have underlined the words added or changed:

social, cultural and developmental influences on schooling;
legal, policy, and economic relationships to education;
learning environments, including teaching and learning, diagnostic processes, and supervision of instruction;
leadership and management functions and processes, including applications of technology;
theories of organization, and methods of organizational change;
policy studies and methodologies of policy analysis;
assessment and evaluation process;
moral and ethical factors in schooling.

The latter items were even referred to as "These **standards** [emphasis added]" which " lend themselves to the process of accreditation, and they should be incorporated as conditions for the conduct of all school leadership programs."

Similar language is found up through the drafting of the ISLLC and subsequent states' standards. How should we interpret these revisions? Are they meaningful or inconsequential? Were there struggles over specific words? Why were some words removed or qualifiers added? If these were to be the standards, a model for educational leadership, why the changing language even among the same members of the same board? Is there a connection between the isomorphism of standards and the repetitions in recorded history? Have these repeated ideas become "an abiding framework"? Has the "evolution" from competencies to proficiencies to performance, and standards had the intended effect of creating its own persuasive logic, making ISLLC Standards seem inevitable and progressive, a systematic, if not unified, whole? Clearly, the answers to such questions will have to be written in the history of the standards' movement. My own experiences in facilitating the Louisiana State Standards for Principals tells me that such debates were meaningful and need to be revealed in order for the standards to be interpreted contextually and successfully across school districts and states.

A final comment regarding the language of the standards: although the number of national standards may be parsimonious, the bulleted indicators under knowledge, dispositions, and performances are anything but. There are 43 indicators of knowledge and skills. 43 different dispositions, and 96 performances. Rather than a few broad, guiding principles, the ISLLC model has assumed an almost trait-like contingency-quality dominated by the specific job behaviors. "Recorded history" will repeat the words "only six broad standards" and "a parsimonious model," until they become part of the unquestioned and taken-for-granted litany. The language, however, reveals a different reality.

Critical Lessons Learned

One interpretation of the above "recorded history" is that through repeated tellings the standards become an unquestioned and uncritical product. They reflect a meta-narrative of efficiency and effectiveness, while ignoring the political conflicts, educational debates, and organizational benefits derived from finding a meaning for the standards inside of opposing positions. Even opposition to the ISLLC Standards requires a considered response which, I would argue, is preferable to just going along with whatever reform happens to be mandated at the time. From a critical perspective, "we can no longer rest easy in this view" (Gergen, 1999. p. 204): that is, the listings of Commissions, the documenting and publishing of their reports, the continued use of these precedents without critically questioning what happened and why. We know too much about the politics apart from and within the "recorded history" and how it has been constructed and retold. It is in this political context that each of us should re-examine the ISLLC standards.

Alternative Possibilities

Underlying the alternative possibilities are two main points:

> National and State standards [for leaders] could be seen as stimulating ongoing inquiry or as points of departure from normalized practices, rather than accepted as fixed, universal truths to be learned, implemented, and followed; and
>
> National and State standards [including the policymaking of standards] could be seen as a power/knowledge struggle with uncertain and problematic outcomes, rather than accepted uncritically as a rational, progressive process-product.

Somewhere between an infinite variety of administrative choices and a binary either-or choice lies a preferable response for educational leaders. One of the most difficult tasks facing professors/researchers in educational leadership is to make explicit why this in-between space is really preferable. Given current realities of the job, we quickly come face-to-face with situations demanding answers, any answer, as opposed to raising new questions. As men and women of action, open-endedness in educational leadership is not a viable alternative. This is where educational leadership ceases to be philosophical. Yet at the very same time, at the heart of educational administration lies social philosophical questions. Somewhere in-between, we are looking for a critically pragmatic space.

At the beginning of the last century, Dewey introduced an alternative social philosophy called reconstruction. Unlike Kant's intellectual tour de force to reconcile the debates between Rationalism and Empiricism, Dewey proposed a truly integrative social philosophy. He attacked the logic of separating abstract ideals from material reality and general principles from specific situations. He did so by elevating the significance of ongoing activities [i.e., inquiry] which (1) fosters individual growth and development, and (2) directs actions towards solving specific social problems. The implications for education, politics, and morality follow.

The reconstruction of reason and experience is meant to generate questions about specific situations instead of providing answers to universal problems. Dewey argued that lived experiences disrupt reason. Thus, in Dewey's own words, reason must be reconstructed as "experimental intelligence" to be "used in the creation of social arts" as "guides of reconstructive action, ... not dogmas." Reason generates "hypotheses to be worked out in practice, to be rejected, corrected... to be used in making our future acts less blind, more directed, ... flexible" (p. 89). This philosophy is a 180 degree turn away from our cultural predisposition towards discovering fixed, general principles and then applying them to problems.

According to one disciple of Dewey's,

> Since the whole weight of tradition is on the side of absolutes, which are abstractions that serve to maintain an aristocratic form of society, such a system [i.e., a progressive educational system] must have direct and constant reference to the conflict between the aristocratic and the democratic ways of life.... It must have a theory of values which has as its center the continuous improvement of human living through voluntary reciprocity or the constant widening of common interests and common concerns. Lastly, it must undertake to point out how the acceptance of a such a standard for growth and progress requires continuous and frequently extensive reconstruction or revision of traditional beliefs and attitudes, in accordance with growing insight and changing circumstances (Bode, B., 1938. pp. 26-27).

How would this philosophical position reshape our views on the ISLLC standards? First, instead of focusing on the content of standards as ideals towards which we should work, Dewey presents standards for growth and development which require continuous modifications in the content of standards, depending upon specific situations – the context in which we work. His social philosophy of reconstruction is an ongoing critical analysis, continuously searching for better alternatives. The test of standards for Dewey are questions: "How numerous and varied are the interests which are consciously shared? How full and free is the interplay with other forms of association?" (see Democracy and Education, p. 96 which is quoted on p. 106 of Bode).

For Dewey (1920/48), promoting one universal set of standards is absurd (p. 141). There are too many contingencies in the material world for a general principle to apply. Moreover, because the condition of material reality is change, then education, itself, must constantly address change as growth in the present. Education is not, as most people understand Dewey, directed towards a

future preparation, but rather, education happens within present experiences. For teachers and educational leaders this indicates that we are promoting growth at any time and place.
How do the ISLLC standards meet these progressive educational ideals and values? Following the ideas of Blake, Smeyers, Smith, and Standish (1998), the very opportunities to debate material conditions, contingencies, and growth -- in order to make educators more sensitive, curious, and appreciative [of others, of difference] (Dewey,1920/1948, p. 154) -- exists in the processes of developing standards, not in their delivery. We saw a glimpse of this phenomenon in the passing reference by Shipman and Murphy when they were "enmeshed in the work." In that setting, new knowledge emerged.

Social Construction and Postmodern Turns

While Dewey's insights are central to any social and philosophical critique of standards, there are other epistemological reasons for extending the critique beyond Dewey. More recent critiques use the meanings of language, discourse, self, and cultural hegemony as alternative starting points. These shifts reflect a postmodern turn towards critiquing the taken-for-granted assumptions found in everyday discourses and actions and the radical deconstruction of knowledge bases.

One example of this departure is the explicit challenge of the notion of the self and the values of individualism (Gergen, 1999). While many of the values of individualism have been used to help create a democratic society [e.g., self-determination], other individualistic values promote careerism, competition, me-first, and distrust of others. From such values, we may raise critical questions as to who is being privileged, silenced, or erased by standards? In arguments reminiscent of Dewey, Gergen shows how the language and logic of standards support self-interests of those in power, thereby perpetuating inequities, and "casts suspicion on the motives of the prominently placed" (p. 23). Standards could be interpreted as privileging those already in power [or at least casting suspicion on their actions in support of standards].

Postmodernism seeks to disrupt taken-for-granted meanings and modernist tendencies toward binary distinctions by exposing them as arbitrary, unnecessary, incomplete, and contingent. It seeks to elevate the significance of words by equating them to actions (Gergen, 1999, pp. 35, 77). Yet even at the level of action, modern binary thinking persists in its domination: e.g., there are actions which establish and maintain order versus actions which are critical, resistant and subversive. The two sets of actions are placed by postmodern thought in constant tension.
On the level of practice, there are strategic actions taken to try to blur distinctions; and radical actions taken to explode the binaries apart. Gergen argues that simply blurring distinctions does not break out of the modernistic binary mode of thinking; more radical actions are needed which he refers to alternately as "generative theory," "audacious theorizing," and "poetic activism" (pp. 116-117, following P. Lather). Each of these terms may be tied to establishing different kinds of communicative and pedagogical relationships.

Using hermeneutics to open up avenues for possibilities of meanings, Gergen objects to the common sense uses of the words and phrases, such as "problems," "individual responsibility" and "accountability" as the basis for exercising power: their presumed emphasis being on structural,

hierarchical power which evolves into an hegemonic ideology of an individually constructed reality (p. 204). The alternative proposed by Gergen is a negotiated reality (p. 177), emphasizing relationships. From a postmodern perspective, the self is constituted by relationships with others. There is no concept or primacy of self prior to other people and discourse (Blake, et al., 199 , pp. 13, 23). Meanings are fluid because they are socially constructed with the help of prior knowledge, material conditions, and mediated by language (p.30). The radical, deconstruction sees reality as infinite and continuous combinations of multiple differences and possibilities [not just two binary structural opposites].

Returning to the logic and language of standards, the radical deconstruction of concepts challenges the static meaning and fixed role of standards as if it ought to be followed [automatically, if not mindlessly] as a set of ideals. With deconstruction, standards represent open-ended possibilities for individual and group growth. The process is called critique, an analysis of the dynamics of meanings [in specific situations] and power whereby no one meaning, individual, or group is privileged, thus creating possibilities for new and more equitable social relationships. In other words, there is no disconnect between teaching and learning and social justice.

Reclaiming Pedagogy

The format of the ISLLC Standards are knowledge, dispositions, and performances. It conceptually recognizes and transforms the meaning of leadership into an integrative model of relationships. On this abstract level, the ISLLC model represents research-based progress. Yet, within the dominant cultural paradigm of effectiveness and efficiency, the truth and power behind the doing of these standards are accepted uncritically. There are no substantial challenges to their representation as a set of ideal ends towards which the educational leadership community [e.g., Furman-Brown] should work. They have been drafted by experts and are now ready for implementation.

The social construction and postmodern turns described in the previous section challenged this paradigm in terms of the taken-for-granted assumptions behind the ISLLC standards. But just as standards only symbolically foster support for reforms in public education, so, too, is the above deconstruction more symbolic than real. With respect to the former, the acts of drafting standards do not automatically improve the material conditions of schooling. With respect to deconstruction, interactive learning is needed to make material connections to professional development [of educational leaders] and school improvement: such actions deserve to be called a critical pedagogy.

The basic premise of a critical pedagogy is that teaching and learning standards involves making past discussions, debates, conflicts, and social issues explicit in terms of conducting present day discussions and debates. The teaching and learning processes resist taking the expedient route of accepting the content of standards as finished and complete. In addition to questioning the content [e.g., discussing the meaning of terms in different contexts], teaching and learning questions the social interactions of developing and implementing the standards. At every stage, it challenges the apparent separation of content from acts of learning, as well as the apparent unidimensionality and

linearity presented in the language and logic of the "recorded history" of standards. And, it does so inside the very system that creates and perpetuates a cultural hegemony of values and ideas. What sense does it make to claim that educational leadership is outside of the official and legal control of the educational system? The power of pedagogy is that even when we are aware of top down control, state manipulation, etc., pedagogical interactions themselves are emancipating in terms of reconstructing new knowledge/action/power and experiencing the joy [i.e., the aesthetic qualities] of learning.

Rephrasing the argument

For over a hundred years, the grand narrative of efficiency has dominated educational leadership (Bobbitt, 1912; Callahan, 1962). As a grand narrative, it silences the opportunities in educational leadership for engaging the creative spirit of pedagogy (see Evans, 1999). Although supporters and critics of ISLLC alike have noted the inclusion of a specific Teaching and Learning Standard, the dominant administrative practices as well as the development and implementation issues continue to treat this particular standard as one of many discrete job tasks to be performed by school principals in order to get the job done (see Bogotch, Miron, & Murry, 1998).

But in what sense is the job ever complete? Here the traditional debate in philosophy raised by Plato and extended by Kant becomes relevant, that is, the issue of certain knowledge versus contingencies. In modern day terms, Blake and his colleagues write, "No prescriptive, official government document can afford to emphasize the contingent, revisable nature of its own language game; and this, in the context of the relationship between language and human ends, means that it cannot but give us a misleading picture of how we stand" (p. 137). It is towards destablizing the artificial foundation of ISLLC that we hope to reconstruct a better alternative for educational leadership standards. The discussion here has direct implications for a new meaning of educational change along pedagogical lines. For too long, implementation has been mistakenly equated with the "level of action," consigning development to a chronologically prior and one-time status. Whereas the joys of learning are apparent in development, implementation has lacked a critical pedagogy.

Missing from discussions of standards is the creative spirit of "development," that is, being "enmeshed in the work" (Shipman & Murphy). In its place,we find the technical issues of reproduction during delivery and implementation, denying the very practices [and creative of joy] found in teaching and learning.

At stake is whether educational leadership can hope to reclaim pedagogical values as part of the ethos of the field. Without pedagogical leadership, our actions and understanding will remain at the miseducative and structural levels of Taylorism in its various guises. Educational leadership has an opportunity to socially reconstruct itself as a field of practice by making standards educationally viable through participating in the on-going contextual re-development of standards as opposed to developing and implementing them as is.

The Disposition of Surprise: An Illustrated Example

Consistent with Dewey and the conceptual framework of this paper: a critical postmodern position is the rejection of a "last" word. As educators, we are continuously growing and socially constructing new and surprising, if not better, futures. The significance of the postmodern analysis is that it displaces the last word, recreating it as a viable beginning. Meanings continue beyond the last word. Such views are opposed by individuals and groups who are working to maintain their current status and power, and those who do not see how their thoughts and actions serve to limit debate.

For many, the standards movement is a new beginning: it is the most recent attempt to systematize and unify our field so that it may develop legitimate and quality programs. But, from a postmodern perspective, in so doing, proponents of standards are silencing and ignoring alternative points of view -- but not, completely. The pedagogical spaces inside of the development processes offer hope and room for pedagogical leadership. Because standards can't succeed totally [in closing off discussion and resistance], they contain possibilities for their own educational success.

One illustration of this is the attempt to write out of the standards the disposition of surprise from the discourse and practice of educational administration. The power of pedagogy is too easily overlooked even by the supporters of standards. ISLLC supporters have confused dispositions with predispositions. We seem intent upon bypassing pedagogy with personnel practices (e.g., Etzioni, Fiedler, Myers and Briggs). But as educators, classroom teachers of leadership, we work with students to instill, rediscover, and question their current values. Our methods and programs, when they work, create cognitive dissonance in order to promote growth/change. The decision to focus on dispositions prior to participation in certification program negates the pedagogical power of growth; denigrates and devalues education. Candidates for leadership do not come with all the pre-dispositions we would want: that's precisely why we teach/socialize leadership . We've worked very hard to establish a pedagogical basis for leadership as an alternative to selecting leaders on the basis of birth or innate characteristics, which may be reflected in a set of pre-existing dispositions. Every educator, from aspiring administrators to veterans, is in the process of learning/growth.

As with all personnel practices, it is easier to set standards than to teach — but it's almost easier to do anything other than teaching [critically]. How can standards which profess to support teaching and learning miss the value/opportunity to do so as part of the leadership learning processes? We want to bring educators inside of the knowledge of leadership, not exclude them on the basis of pre-dispositions. We need to trust the power of pedagogy, not negate it. We literally will have to teach our way through this current crisis of legitimacy.

When we look towards other fields of inquiry such as literature, art, history, economics [even economics and market irrationality], political science, etc., the role of human foibles are openly discussed. Inside and out of the academy, uncertainty, creativity, surprise and experimentation are now guiding principles in such disciplinary field as physics, computer technology, and economics. Outside of educational institutions, the western world is moving at warp speed in all directions. Creative ideas are the "new new thing" and have literally become the currency of knowledge. Why

is there more free expression in these "traditional" fields than in educational leadership? Why are they more open to surprise than we are? Why does education exclude creative possibilities and fear surprise?

It cannot be that education (as philosophy or as research) has not seen this connection historically. In 1966, Halpin, a leader in the theory movement in educational administration, quoted Alfred Whitehead as follows: "My point is that a block in the assimilation of ideas inevitably arises when a discipline of precision is imposed before a stage of romance has run its course in the growing mind. There is no comprehension apart from romance" (p. 306). Even at the height or end of the theory movement in educational leadership, this relationship was obvious.

Not so today. How are the ISLLC standards relevant to today's real world? How do they address middle class abandonment of public education, immigrant education in public schools, the continued ghetto-ization of black Americans? In a "don't ask, don't tell," "just do it" culture, how will standards be used to educate and lead? Do the ISLLC standards foster understandings of e-commerce, dot com culture, along with the explosion of wealth that leaves behind others including educators. Do the standards serve as a spring board to possibilities or do they represent new constraints?

The recorded history of the ISLLC standards has written romance (and conflict) out of our history. The irony is that in the real world, school administrators face as much conflict and stress if not more than most other professionals. Yet, theories of conflict, decision-making choice, and the theories of non-rationalism remain separate and apart from everyday conflicts and stress. When the most theoretical of fields, physics turns to imagination before we do; when medicine, the most staid, conservative of professions, turns to alternatives cures before we do, then why is educational leadership not considering its own new, new thing? How can we make sense of postmodern conditions outside of schools by devising ways to hermetically seal off schools from politics and change?

Reclaiming Pedagogy Again

What do educated people do in the real world? They design, connect, anticipate, discover, discard, express, risk, appreciate, etc. How do we teach educators to be intellectually adventurous, curious, and to learn from mistakes and experiences? And how do we do this without delay?

It is insufficient to just write [the wrong medium] and critique. Those of us who read theory but who also teach in graduate administrative preparation programs need to translate these ideas into pedagogical actions. Abstract ideas are not the medium for change among practicing educators [or western society]. Rather, a critical pedagogy to engage school people has to involve the concrete, material conditions in which they work and out of which they form their opinions. It won't be easy to move from theory to action so long as "commonsense" dominants our thinking. Researchers, professors and policymakers need to make the connections between ideas and material conditions far more concrete than they do in writing and actions. For too long, intangibles and internal motivations were regarded as just and sufficient rewards for educators. Frankly material goods

matter today more than ever before. For surprise and counterintuition to be appealing to educators who are more practical, pedagogy and research need to make connections to change more not less concrete.

If we want to move educators towards the disposition of surprise, then we need to make these concepts attractive possibilities, not just open-ended abstractions or infinite choices. We need to demonstrate concretely how surprise works on behalf of positive change, why turning conventional wisdom on its head leads to fresh ideas and motivations. The challenge is to reconstruct the fixed lifeworld of educators [including professors].

One alternative is for all educators to be part of development, with all of the conflict and debate that will entail. Standards are educational and educators are capable of learning. The goal of reclaiming pedagogy is to free educators to embrace surprise, seek out counterintuitive findings, learn from accident, work with not against disruptions. Pedagogy is a deliberate intervention to teach that such possibilities may be found inside of developing policies like ISLLC standards.

References

Blake, N., Smeyers, P., Smith, R., & Standish, P. (1998). Thinking again: Education after postmodernism. Westport, Ct: Bergin & Garvey

Bobbitt, F. (1913). The supervision of city schools: Some general principles of management applied to the problems of city-school systems. 12th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part I, Bloomington, ILL

Bode, B. (1938). Progressive education at the crossroads pp.26-27 New York: Newson & Company

Bogotch, I, Miron, L., & Murry, J. (1998). Moral leadership discourses in urban school settings: The multiple influences of social context. Urban Education, 33(3), 303-330.

Bogotch, I., Williams, P., & Hale, J. (1995). School managerial control: Validating a social concept. Journal of Educational Administration, 33(1), 44-62.

Dewey, J. (1920/1948). Reconstruction in philosophy. New York: Mentor Books

Callahan, R. (1962). Education and the cult of efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Donmoyer, R. Imber, D., & Scheursch, J. (1995). The knowledge base in educational administration: Multiple perspectives. Albany: SUNY Press

Forsyth, P. (Fall, 1999). UCEA Newsletter, p. 17

Gergen, K. (1999). An invitation to social construction. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Griffiths, D. (1999). Introduction. In J. Murphy & P. Forsyth (Eds.). Educational Administration: A decade of reform, Introduction. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press

Halpin, A. (1966). Theory and research in administration p. 306. NY: MacMillan Co. [quote taken from Whitehead, A.N. (1929). The Aims of Education p. 52. NY: MacMillan Co).

Louisiana State Department of Education. (June, 1998). Standards for School Principals in Louisiana

Meier, D. (2000). Will standards save public education. Boston: Beacon Press.

Murphy, J. & Forsyth, P. (Eds.). (1999). Educational Administration: A decade of reform. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press

Murphy, J. & Forsyth, (1999) A decade of change: An overview. In J. Murphy & P. Forsyth (Eds.). Educational Administration: A decade of reform, Chapter 2, p. 28. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press

O'Neil, J. (May, 1991). Go slow on National Curriculum tests, ASCD Warned. ASCD Update, 23(4), pp. 1, 6-7

Rothman, R. (February 5, 1992). Standards and testing report is hailed, criticized. Education Week, p. 8

School Leadership Development Task Force, (May 4, 1998). Strengthening Educational Leadership in Louisiana. Louisiana State Department of Education

Shipman, N. & Murphy, J. (July 17, 1996). ISLLC Standards. Preface

Taylor, W. (November 15, 2000). "Standards, tests, and Civil Rights" Education Week, pp. 56,40.

Thomson, S. (1999). "Causing change: The National Policy Board for Educational Administration." In J. Murphy, J. & P. Forsyth (Eds.). Educational Administration: A decade of reform Chapter 5, p. 100. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press

Van Meter, E. & Murphy, J. (July, 1997). Using ISLLC Standards to strengthen preparation programs in school administration. Paper prepared for the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: Council of Chief State School Officers.

1. This paper was originally presented at the Annual Meeting of AERA, New Orleans, April, 2000

2. Even as a "recorded history," there were many more documents than those discussed here. One of the most influential documents was a synthesis paper written by Leithwood and Duke (March, 1996) titled "Defining effective leadership for Connecticut's schools."

3. The concepts and theories which were part of my pedagogical-development framework were tested empirically with a group of educators who had participated in developing the Louisiana Leadership Standards which conformed to the national ISLLC Standards. I intend to publish the empirical results confirming the pedagogical differences between standards' development and standards' implementation in a separate paper.